

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-8, 18 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2 828 000 in view of Uozumi or Mohler. Claim 19 was rejected as being unpatentable over FR 2 828 000 in view of Uozumi or Mohler and further in view of Uetsuhara. Claims 1 and 6 have been canceled. Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 18 and 19 depend from claim 29.

Amended claim 29 recites:

“wherein the reduced magnet weight part comprises, in the direction of the displacement, a first magnet bar and a second magnet bar, the first and second magnet bars having a same magnetization orientation, and the first and second magnet bars being spaced by a lesser density portion having a density less than that of the magnet bars,

wherein said means for triggering the displacement includes at least one conductor arranged as at least two meanders each formed with sections of successive conductors in which a current flows in opposite directions, and

wherein, when the mobile magnetic portion is stuck on one of said attraction areas, the first and second magnet bars cooperate with one of the sections (31.1 or 31.2), and the current flows in the same direction in said one of the sections.”

The means for triggering described in amended claim 29 (e.g., at least one conductor arranged as at least two meanders each formed with sections of successive conductors) can be seen in Figs. 2B and 2C. Additionally, first and second magnet bars 24.1 as recited in claim 29 are shown in Figs. 2B and 2C.

None of the prior art of record discloses, or otherwise renders foreseeable, a means for triggering the displacement of a mobile magnet portion that includes at least one conductor arranged as at least two meanders each formed with sections of successive conductors in which a current flows in opposite directions and, wherein, when the mobile magnetic portion is stuck on one of said attraction areas, the first and second magnet bars cooperate with one of the sections (31.1 or 31.2), and the current flows in the same direction in said one of the sections. Indeed, none of the prior art of record discloses the meanders recited in claim 29. The configuration of a triggering means having at least one conductor with at least two meanders is advantageous because it reduces the current consumption for displacement of the mobile magnetic portion (see, e.g., application page 5, lines 21-30 and page 22, line 19 to page 23, line 29).

In view of the differences between the subject matter of claim 29 and the cited references, applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is allowable over said references. Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 18 and 19 depend from claim 29.

New claims 30-32 have been added and also depend from claim 29.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appln. No. 10/562,748
Amendment dated June 2, 2010
Reply to Office Action dated December 7, 2009

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. BRV-39291.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: Brad C. Spencer
Brad C. Spencer – Reg. No. 57,076

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 2, 2010